

PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-S

PC-S1

From: Michael Sanders [sanders@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 2:35 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: Proposed Toll Lanes for 405 Freeway

To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of Rossmoor, I strongly oppose addition of HOT lanes to the San Diego Freeway. The inclusion of such lanes on the northbound 405 without continuation into Los Angeles will create a bottleneck at the 605 Freeway, creating environmental and related impacts on nearby residents, including the community of Rossmoor.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Sanders
12132 Christy Lane
Rossmoor, CA 90720

PC-S2

From: Bob Satmary [bob.satmary@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: 405 toll stupidity

Every taxpaying citizen in the state is opposed to toll roads. Californians already pay the highest taxes in the nation. There's no way we should be asked to pay a penny more--especially for the use of something we're all already paying for.

When are you people going to realize that lessening traffic isn't about increasing capacity--it's about empowering people to leave their cars in the garage--it's about putting fewer cars on the road. Build light-rail commuter lines already!!! Wake up!!!!

PC-S3

From: Dan Schechter [profdanschechter@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 9:55 AM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: No toll lanes on the 405 in West Orange County, please!

405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS@Parsons.com

Dear Caltrans –

We are strongly opposed to the idea of including toll lanes on the 405 project in the Rossmoor/Los Alamitos/Seal Beach area. This is a wholesale switch from the original plan, and it is grossly unfair. Only wealthier people will be able to use these lanes, even though everyone's gasoline taxes have already been spent on the construction project. This is essentially a transfer of wealth from lower income people to upper income people, which makes no sense at all.

The new "non-toll" HOV lanes on the 405 in Los Angeles County are working just fine -- note that they have greatly reduced congestion, especially in the West LA area. Why not emulate that model, rather than the dubious "Lexus lanes" being used on the 110 in LA County?

And while you're building new lanes, you might save a few bucks by omitting the bas relief "artwork" on the sound walls. For an example of wasteful spending, check out the sound wall on the northbound 605 in the Los Alamitos area. The artwork is ugly, and (ironically) it is now being covered over by foliage. When we are driving, we do not need to be distracted by expensive public "art."

Thanks for listening,

Dan Schechter and Felice Sussman
11292 Wallingsford
Los Alamitos, California, 90720
562-430-9406

PC-S4

To Whom it May Concern,

I strongly do NOT want the sound wall taken down and moved closer to the homes. I live right off of Almond and feel the noise would greatly increase plus lower the value of the homes.

Almond needs to be two lanes. It is major street making access to all the cul-de-sacs. How will we access our homes?

Linda Scott
3530 Jasmine Ave
Seal Beach

PC-S5

From: Seiff, Kenneth [kseiff@uci.edu]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS
Subject: Comments sent 3:54 PM, 8/12/13

Smita Deshande, Branch Chief

CalTrans District 12

"Attn: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period"

August 10, 2013

Dear Sirs:

Thank you for this opportunity to submit comments regarding the 405 SDEIR-DEIS (Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement) with respect to the 405 Improvement Project and impacts upon the greater Long Beach and west Orange County areas. As a resident of College Park West, Seal Beach, I am an Orange County resident but great potential impacts and effects are possible for my area in particular. I am sensitive to and support the environmental, safety, and traffic concerns of the Seal Beach and Long Beach residents who have voiced a great many of these. However with respect to the Study Area, I wish to limit my comments solely to concerns regarding Intersection 27: Westbound SR-22/Studebaker Rd. On/Off Ramps, Intersection 28: Eastbound SR-22/Studebaker Rd. On/Off Ramps, and Intersection 29: Westbound SR-22/College Park Drive On/Off Ramps in this communication. Since College Park Drive is the ONLY ingress and egress for our neighborhood, this obviously has serious significance. But all 3 of these intersections are some of the closest to the planned 405 improvement areas; very close in fact, and will be impacted by the increased traffic flow and volume generated by that project. Also, this greater multi-intersection area is very important not only to all the residents surrounding (Long Beach especially) but also, since 7th Street also passes right through there, a central hub and main freeway access to and from these large neighborhood areas, large business interests (including the AES Energy Plant) and the Belmont Shore and Naples business and beach areas, Cal State Long Beach, and the Long Beach VA, among many others. This by any account is a very important interchange area that is need of more extensive mitigation to handle the added "stress" that will come with the 405 improvement project and, at least for Intersection 28 (Eastbound SR-22/Studebaker On/Off Ramps), seems to have not been examined and dealt with in a manner compatible with the unique circumstances of that specific very essential intersection. I hope to make these points to your satisfaction in the following and hope, and expect, these remarks will be examined and responded to by you in the same very serious manner with which they are being submitted.

Intersection 28: Eastbound SR-22/Studebaker Road On/Off Ramps: COMMENTS

- Even a cursory direct examination of this intersection will reveal to the non-expert that it is in terrible condition; the physical assets and infrastructure components are disintegrating and have been for some time; this is very well known to those of us in the area and in fact even the design is flawed and antiquated, which has been admitted by CalTRANS District 7.
- This intersection has not had even cursory improvements made for many, many years and per check with District 7 CalTRANS, none are planned for future as of now.
- Meantime, the continued deterioration of the pavement decks, shoulders, drainage, lighting (almost none), and etc. is made worse and worse since this intersection has served and continues to serve as a construction staging area for so many major projects up and down the

PC-S5 (Continued)

- 405 Freeway for many, many years. (Perhaps OCTA could make assurances that at least for once at any rate this area will NOT be used as major construction staging area—time for rest!)
- I challenge anyone to walk and drive that area with me personally and refute that this intersection is in the absolute worst physical condition of any of the interchanges listed in the Study Area; the physical structures are deteriorating and the infrastructure is crumbling.
 - It is the strong concern of myself and of many others in our area that this intersection specifically will not have the structural integrity to "tolerate"/survive the coming impacts from increased traffic, flow, and service impacts from the WCC and 405 Improvement Projects in the coming years without some mitigation, and major structural failures are inevitable. There are already severe traffic flow and safety issues there now and have been for some time. Further failure will only impede traffic flow and safety at the time and cause need for "urgent" and disruptive repairs—this certainly will not benefit those of us who live, work, and/or commute through the area. Does it not make sense to confront this now; what are the reasonable arguments against this?...it seems so obvious if this unique and particular intersection is really taken for a good hard look at; it does not seem this was done in the Supplemental study and only the "usual" parameters were utilized. Unfortunately, this is not appropriate for this one intersection and it is a sad commentary that this was missed; even a non-expert can see this.
 - This intersection, however, was not listed as one that would be entitled to mitigation from the 405 Project under any of the alternatives; this makes no sense. It is listed as potentially impacted as much or almost as much as any other interchange/intersection, yet barely "misses" the arbitrary "thresholds" set for determining need for mitigation in the document.
 - These "thresholds" are indeed arbitrary; the second to last page of the document states that "Because Caltrans does not use threshold criteria for the determination of significance of impacts, discussion of threshold criteria was removed from the document at the request of Caltrans environmental staff." This appears to mean that OCTA and CalTRANS District 12 COULD utilize other criteria to evaluate significance with respect to needed mitigation for any particular interchange, including the structural and physical state and integrity of that area currently that will be impacted. Why this was not done for this interchange is really beyond me; fortunately, this is the only intersection that is in such deteriorated condition that such might be required, but it certainly is required for this one and just looking at traffic data in this particular situation truly is "looking at the forest and missing the trees."
 - Further, CEQA actually REQUIRES that the current physical status of an area under evaluation be taken into account as to possible need for mitigation. This was NOT done here apparently and for this specific intersection area which appears to be a major error in my view. (As stipulated under CEQA, "An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant" (14 CCR 15125[a]). It is my opinion that no uniform, inflexible rule is required for determination for "existing conditions baseline" and thus the lead agency (OCTA) could utilize actual physical and structural observation and engineering analysis to measure existing condition and project impacts thereon rather than solely traffic flow and LOS (level of service) data; this intersection requires this even if the others do not due to the unique status of its decaying infrastructure and current state of disrepair that should be apparent to any and all reasonable persons just from observation and without professional expertise. Further, a court ruling in Madera, CA in 2011 indicated that "a baseline...must reflect existing physical conditions."

1
cont

2

PC-S5 (Continued)

- Actually, perhaps even incremental improvements could make a big difference and help to "allow" this interchange and its physical structure components to "survive" and not completely collapse with the coming increased pressure from the WCC and 405 improvements. There is precedent for this; related to the WCC Project, OCTA was able to see the impacts that would occur at the Westbound SR-22/Studebaker On/Off Ramps (Interchange 29 in this Supplemental Document) and last year a collaborative project between them, City of Long Beach, City of Seal Beach, and CalTRANS District 7 was planned and completed—this was more of an incremental improvement and not a "major" project or cost (I had many discussions with Ken Bui and Ken Oh from OCTA/Cal TRANS District 12 about this back then and would be happy to share some of the insight we gained by working together to try to address concerns; it really was quite amazing and much appreciated). This has made a HUGE positive impact on our area I think all agree. A similar approach would be of great assistance and a very positive approach by OCTA for the Eastbound Ramps ((Intersection 28) I am discussing.

Intersection 28: Eastbound SR-22/Studebaker Road On/Off Ramps: CONCLUSIONS AND REQUESTS:

- Ideally, it is my belief that the 405 Improvement Team should take another much closer look at this specific intersection and conclude that in fact, given all the above, this unique and unusual area, VERY DIFFERENT from all the other intersections studied, should be given "special" evaluation for some form of mitigation even if it otherwise does apparently meet the very arbitrary "thresholds" of traffic flow, volume, LOS and etc. utilized in the Supplemental Document
- If this is not deemed appropriate, then I would most humbly request that a FORMAL structural, physical, and transportation engineering study be applied to this interchange with goals of assessing the serious concerns and issues above. In fact, it is my opinion that this is REQUIRED by CEQA, especially since this had now been brought to your specific attention.
- If even this is not to be addressed, then there has to be some plan for the future to address these issues there; again, I do not see how anyone who really takes the time to "really" look into this issue can disagree that this interchange in the current state is at risk for major disruption with flooding (which has happened regularly), traffic safety, and more acute infrastructure failure. This certainly would serve to negate any greater benefit for our area that might be served by the larger WCC and 405 Improvement Projects, as important as they are.
- Finally, I would say that all modern transportation engineers and professionals are well trained to note that any roadway, corridor, interchange, or intersection is more than "just" the traffic flow, car trips, and etc. that are measure. The area and people surrounding that it serves and the purposes it is utilized for need to be taken into account as much as "car trips", ratios, and "queue" lengths. None of that will matter if the pavement deck and associated infrastructure crumbles and collapses soon. Improving this area with some mitigation for the upcoming projects can only help all these aspects and is required for this specific interchange. I would be happy to personally show anyone what I am discussing if they may be unfamiliar and would want further "proof" of the conditions there now.

Intersections 27 and 29: Westbound SR-22/Studebaker Road On/Off Ramps: CONCLUSIONS AND REQUESTS

- I am very gratified that these 2 interchanges in the study area were deemed eligible for mitigation measures per the arbitrary threshold criteria utilized; this is obviously necessary for traffic flow purposes if not structural aspects (other than how those impact each other obviously). Unlike Intersection 28 per above discussion, the physical infrastructure at these 2 related intersections is in much better shape due to the collaborative project mentioned above that OCTA was a part of—see above (again, a similar approach for Intersection 28 above might be very helpful and should be considered). Given that I am in agreement with the

2
cont.

PC-S5 (Continued)

PC-S6

findings for the most part for Intersections 27 and 29 as noted, an area that directly impacts my neighborhood personally since College Park Drive is our only entry and egress, I would like to make the following suggestions and requests to optimize the mitigations planned.

- The mitigation plans mentioned appear to be thought necessary for Alternatives 1 and 2 only; again "just missing" the arbitrary thresholds for eligibility for Alternative 3. Close review of the data I maintain should indicate that the mitigation proposed for these interchanges should apply also for Alternative 3 if it in fact is the chosen alternative.
- Since the pavement improvements to the off-ramp is listed as only being for 300 feet, I recommend that a large lighted sign notifying traffic exiting the freeway that a signal is ahead would be very important; we see these in other situations on the freeways.
- "Final" improvements at the area are still pending from the incremental collaborative project from last year such as lighting, better drainage, better pavement and shoulders (especially at the ramp portion heading toward north Studebaker Road and ideally with curbing throughout), and landscaping (if can afford), and etc. should be completed as part of the mitigation project. This intersection, after all these years "deserves" to be treated as a "modern" interchange similar to all those up and down the 405 and 22 (and of course, same is to be said for Intersection 28 discussed above) and we, the residents of east Long Beach and Seal Beach, workers, students, and commuters to and through the are certainly "deserve" this, especially after waiting such for so many years while so many other improvement projects go on around us and impact us (WCC, 405 improvement, Seal Beach Blvd. improvement, etc., etc.). These 3 intersections in particular (and I am aware of the reasons for this) have been "forgotten" for a long, long time. It seems it should finally be "our turn" now and OCTA could do a lot to accomplish this, demonstrating much good will, given the years of direct impact we already have had with WCC and etc. at the least it would seem.
- Although seems obvious, it was not specifically mentioned in the Supplemental that I could note: a new traffic signal is planned at Intersection 29 (Off-ramp and College Park Drive) and this of course must be carefully synchronized with the existing signal at Studebaker (Intersection 27) to optimize traffic flow, level of service, etc.
- Finally, although also not mentioned that I could find (maybe I missed it) related to the new traffic signal at Intersection 29 is the Left Hand Turn Lane. There currently is a dedicated one for left turn from the westbound onramp coming from the north to turn onto College Park Drive; is this planned to continue and will there be Left Turn Only (Green Arrow) during the traffic signal phase? I would recommend that but at any rate, I believe should be studied rigorously to determine if optimally necessary to improve vehicle flow and service there, especially during peak times.

Thank you very much again for the opportunity to submit these remarks and requests. I truly hope these will be properly and sincerely addressed and, ideally, even thought reasonable and actually adopted/enacted. I remain available to answer any questions and/or supply any other information that I can regarding these opinions and would welcome the opportunity to further discuss with anyone, especially from OCTA and CalTRANS, including in-person visit and review of the area under question—that would be my pleasure.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Sciff
121 Yale Lane
Seal Beach, CA 90740
Cellular: 714-813-8267

From: alan.shipley63@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2013 2:30 PM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS
Subject: 405 Widening Project

I have lived next to the 405 freeway in Seal Beach since 1968. My home is one of the homes directly effected by your decisions in this matter. Over the years it is true that the traffic has increased and additional lanes are needed to help reduce the impact.

While adding lanes south of I-605 and north of CA73, it does very little to help the congestion that will be caused by the bottleneck you are going to add northbound into Long Beach where no additional lanes are being added. So, on the 405 north at the 605 you are going to reduce the traffic lanes back to 4 GP and 1 CP lane thus causing a backup. Southbound I405 at CA73 has no problems, yet.... but lets add 2 lanes and then take them away and see what happens.

Another issues that has come up is that in order to widen the freeway through Seal Beach, you will need to cut into the Collage Park East Development. While the Seal Beach Weapons Station has an excess amount of room to allow realignment of the freeway to happen. The Weapons Stations has said that they need that room as a buffer zone to prevent any damage if they were to have an explosion on site, moving the freeway closer would put it in the debris zone. BULLSHIT! If the Navy was so worried about debris, then move the freeway 20 feet south and build a 20 foot tall debris catch fence. This fence would serve a second purpose of adding additional protection to the base, sounds like a win win solution.

Carpool v toll lanes. REALLY! More toll lanes on already paid for "free"ways. Purpose built toll lanes are one thing, no complaints about them. But charging people for using carpool lanes is wrong, maybe you should just start catching and ticketing the single occupant cars using the carpool lanes, that should generate a large chunk of money every single day. On my drive through OC I always count at least 20 cars in the section you are talking about all with one occupant, and at a minimum of \$150.00 each! There is money to be made. I also travel I110 and see the toll lanes they added and how few people use them because some just don't have the \$5-\$10 each day to use them, AND I love watching the cars jumping out of the toll lanes as they come up on one of the overhead readers so not to be caught, only to jump back into the toll lanes right after.

This crap has been going on and on for years at HUGE expense to the citizens of California, but then what do you expect from people who sit in big glass offices making decisions for the rest of the State, all while bringing in the big bucks and living in their gated communities.

Have a wonderful day

Alan Shipley
Seal Beach

Sent from Windows Mail

PC-S7

From: Elliott_Singer@ahm.honda.com
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2013 10:39 AM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS
Subject: Public Comment

Good morning. OK I spent last evening reading much of the SDIR/EIS for the I-405 project. And I think, not positive though, that I understand the major concepts. The area with which I have the most concern is the changes to the original plans for the I-405 to the I-605. It sure seems like we have only two alternatives, although it is written in such as way as to obfuscate the reality. The choices seem to be an addition of (2) or (4) lanes, overlaid with some sort of "toll" option. Your conclusion is that these actions will reduce congestion.

I'll try to keep my response concise:

The impact of an additional (4) lanes on the homes along the freeway is out of the question.

The impact of 2 additional lanes, depending on how far they are from the homes is acceptable.

A toll that merely adds an expense to the taxes I pay for highway and discriminates against those with lower incomes, is not acceptable.

And a couple of final questions: What if your prediction that congestion will be reduced does not happen? How is the reduced congestion going to be monitored? Is anyone going to take the blame if the predictions do not happen? Will you refund my tax dollars that you used for your project if you are wrong? With the anticipated increases in population have you predicted the time it will take for the congestion to return to current levels?

Thank you for your time.

Elliott Singer
Los Alamitos

1

2

3

PC-S8

Please do not expand the freeway by CPE. There are too many good reasons NOT to move our super sized wall already in place. We oppose the increased pollution, decrease in property values, ridiculous costs to create a horrendous bottleneck when the freeway merges with L.A. County.

1

Sincerely,

Paulette Smith
4488 Candlerbury Ave
Leal Beach, CA 90740

PC-S9

Reasons NOT to tear down
The sound wall

1. Unnecessary
2. won't help eliminate more traffic
3. Disruptive
4. Much too expensive
5. Increase in air quality
6. decline in property value

Mary Stevens
4362 Birchwood Ave.
S. B. 90740
Resident since 1972

PC-S10

From: ssteponovich@socal.rr.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 11:47 AM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: NO TOLL ROADS PLEASE

RPMT, RCSD, RHA, Cities of Seal Beach and Los Alamitos all oppose the building of the proposed toll road for the following reasons:

1. A bottle neck with be created at the I-405/605;
2. Increased air pollution;
3. We have paid for this freeway through our taxes and not for the monetary gain of CalTrans or OCTA.

PC-S11

From: Doreen Stevens [doreenstevens@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2013 11:35 AM
To: wknowles@octa.net
Cc: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: 405 Driving Conditions

August 12, 2013

OCTA Board Members
PO Box 14184
Orange, CA 92863
Attention Wendy Knowles: Please distribute to each board member
wknowles@octa.net
405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS@parsons.com

OCTA Board Members:

Since the 405 freeway has been widened, I have driven to Long Beach many times. Business meetings, doctor's appointments, hair appointments, grocery shopping, dental appointments, hospital visits, and church attendance are all regular errands that require me to take the 405.

At least a couple of times, I have come within inches of being hit by other people driving/flying 65-75 miles per hour as they exit onto 7th Street or the 605 freeway. I am trying to get on the freeway from the Seal Beach Blvd entrance and match their speed as I try to cross over four lanes to go to downtown Long Beach via the 405 North. This combination is what has almost caused an accident.

These lanes crossing is hazardous and is an accident waiting to happen. They are suicide lanes! On paper this might work but in real life this does not work and is totally unacceptable, scary and dangerous! It is so scary that I back track driving and enter from the Valley View entrance going North on the 405 freeway to Long Beach. How many accidents have already happened because of this poorly constructed freeway section? Please somehow correct this problem before lives are lost.

Sincerely,

Doreen Stevens
4880 Candleberry Ave
Seal Beach, CA 90740
doreenstevens@earthlink.net

CC: Ryan Chamberlain
CalTrans District 12
3347 Michelson Drive Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92612

PC-S12

From: Rosie Stewart
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR EIS
Subject: No On Ramp!
Date: Monday, August 12, 2013 10:01:59 PM

Please stop the proposed on ramp on the 405 freeway on Warner/Magnolia entrance. It will severely impact my friend's home by destroying property values and affect her quality of life. Please do not build this!

Thank you!
Rosie Stewart

Sent from my iPhone

1

PC-S13

From: Harvey Storm (RR) [hstorm@socal.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 9:20 PM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR EIS
Cc: cbyrne@octa.net
Subject: I-405 Supplemental Draft Comments
Attachments: I-405 Comments.pdf

Date: August 10, 2013
From: Harvey Storm
9333 Daisy Avenue
Fountain Valley, CA 92708
hstorm@socal.rr.com
To: Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief
Caltrans District 12
Attn: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period
2201 Dupont Dr., Ste. 200, Irvine, CA 92612
405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS@parsons.com
CC: Christina Byrne
Community Relations Officer, OCTA
550 S. Main St., Orange, CA
714-560-5717 Direct Line
cbyrne@octa.net

I-405 SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT COMMENTS

I would like to state my reasons for strongly opposing the proposed braided ramp addition on the Northbound I-405, at the Magnolia-Warner exit/entrance.

1. Quality of Life Damages

Issues involving the destruction of quality of life for the large number of homes adjacent to the proposed braided ramp, along Daisy Ave in Fountain Valley, including:

- The addition of increased noise at all hours from the proposed elevated ramp and unimproved sound wall design causing a more noticeable background disturbance and/or health hazard.
- The exhaust fumes constantly expelled from the proposed elevated ramp will travel further than before causing an increased health hazard to residents along Daisy Ave. and others.
- The negative alteration of the view and beauty of the neighborhood due to the elevated ramps appearance and increased closeness to the homes in the Daisy Ave. area.

1

2. Financial Damage

The financial damage inflicted on the many residents in the Daisy Ave. area by the lowering of property values due to the effects of the proposed ramp. These damages will likely be substantial since a large part of Fountain Valley property values are based on desirable location considerations.

2

3. Lack of Information Provided To Residents

The lack of consideration and timely information provided to Daisy Ave. residents. There are no visuals or other information provided by OCTA relating to the above objections in our area. These appear to have been provided at other improvement point proposals.

3

4. Unnecessary Braided Ramp

The clear lack of actual need for a braided ramp at the I-405 Northbound, Magnolia-Warner entrance/exit location. I have lived on Daisy Ave. many years and constantly use the existing I-405 Northbound, Magnolia-Warner ramps. In thousands of such usages, I have not observed any instance in which the traffic backup was caused by the crossing of the Northbound entrance and exit traffic. All of the backup is caused by the expanding lane and merging traffic confusion required to accommodate accessing the next Northbound exit, (Hwy 39) Beach Blvd. Millions of taxpayers dollars would be wasted, and homeowners lives damaged, in the construction of the braided ramp in question, with little demonstrable gain in traffic flow. In this proposed non-solution, traffic would still be slowed at Beach Blvd. and the Magnolia-Warner Northbound entrances would still be backed up by freeway traffic, merging and metering lights.

4

5. Hopes for Proposal Adjustments

While we, the homeowners on and near Daisy Avenue, are left with no choice but to organize to protect ourselves and redress grievances from the above potential damages, such action is not where our hearts lie. We hope those responsible for the I-405 Expansion Project will give us, belatedly, the consideration we deserve and make necessary adjustments to the present proposal.

Thank you so much for your time and attention,
Harvey Storm

PC-S14

From: Larry Strawther [localsports@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 11:05 PM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS
Cc: 'Don Broun'; 'Elizabeth Deering'; 'Henry Taboada'
Subject: Attention: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period, 2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200, Irvine, CA 92612. Ms. Smita Deshpande Branch Chief-Caltrans District 12.

To whom it may concern –

Attention: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period, 2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200, Irvine, CA 92612. Ms. Smita Deshpande Branch Chief-Caltrans District 12.

This is a video link to a recording made at the special meeting of the Rossmoor Community Services District held on August 12, 2012 at Rush Park Auditorium in Rossmoor. Please note and file in your list of responses and public comments regarding the Interstate 405 Toll Road .

<http://youtu.be/aRGrcFkwFNM>

Thank you.

Larry Strawther

Rossmoor resident
3251 Oranewood Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
(562) 522-6670

Larry Strawther
(562) 522-6670 (cell)
(562) 431-7001 (home office)
www.localsports.biz
www.localhistory.com
www.tasteforlocal.com

1

PC-S15

August 12, 2013

Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief
Caltrans District 12
"Attn: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

Dear Ms. Deshpande:

I would like to submit my comments in regard to the I-405 Supplemental DEIR/DEIS. I have issues with traffic congestion, safety, air quality, diversion onto arterials, and tolling.

I feel that the original EIR did not adequately address traffic congestion at the LA/OC County line. While the Supplemental traffic study looked at traffic in Long Beach, much of the congestion will take place on the Orange County side of the border. The SDEIR found traffic impacts in Long Beach at several intersections. The original DEIR also found a significant impact on Valley View/Bolsa Chica, however, no impacts were identified at Seal Beach Blvd. (Table 3.1.6-1). Looking at this table, on the southbound 405 on ramp, the v/c ratios are significantly increased in 2020 (over existing) in both AM and PM for both the no build and build options; however, in 2040, while the no build v/c ratios increase even more, the v/c ratios for the build options remain unchanged in the PM peak and greatly decrease (even below the existing, 2009 v/c) in the AM peak. Please explain what would cause this greatly reduced congestion in the AM peak for the southbound I-405 entrance ramp in 2040.

I am very concerned about safety, as are many neighbors who will not use the freeway during our present construction. To enter the northbound I-405 from Seal Beach Blvd in all build alternatives, one will have to cross over 4 lanes (within about 2,000 ft.) to proceed north into Long Beach. At times of high traffic volumes, it is often a challenge to do this now, with only two lanes to cross. I feel this will also be a safety issue for our residents.

In Alternative 3, traffic exiting the Express Lanes near the LA County line will be allowed to enter either an HOV lane or the left-hand most general purpose lane. All of the vehicles which are continuing northbound in the mainline general purpose lanes (the majority of traffic) will have to squeeze into the other 3 lanes that lead into LA County. [There is a merging of 2 general purpose lanes at a point just after two general purpose lanes exit to the NB I-605]. This merging will cause a bottleneck to occur. At the same time, 2+ vehicles, which have been traveling in the general purpose lanes, will be merging left, trying to enter the HOV lane in LA County. I believe this addition of weaving will have a negative effect on safety, in an area where exiting and merging already exist. When the 91 Express Lanes were owned by CPTC, the accident rate was 72% above the average. Our accident rate (per DEIR) is lower than average (although it has increased during construction) and I do not want it to increase. Alternatives 1 and Alternatives 2 have HOV lanes that are continuous with those in LA County and would have a much safer, smoother traffic flow.

1

2

3

PC-S15 (Continued)

Increased congestion will also result in a decrease in air quality. In the same area that Alternative 3 compresses all the general purpose lanes, Hopkinson Elementary School lies just over 500 ft. to the East (So may not have been identified as a sensitive receptor). However, this increase in congestion will subject the students to increased exposure to air pollutants. New studies have shown that these pollutants may travel up to a mile inland in early morning hours. The EPA has already identified Rossmoor, due to its proximity to two freeways, as having an increased cancer risk.

4

The I-110 toll lane demonstration project in LA County has shown some tolling resistance. This project does not charge 2+ carpools a toll. They also have a lower transponder monthly charge than that proposed in Alternative 3 (or 91 Express Lanes) and have even eliminated this charge for some drivers. Congestion in the general purpose lanes has also resulted. The 91 Express Lanes, the model for Alternative 3, while financially profitable for OCTA has been identified as the 2nd most congested freeway in the nation. I do not want a similar result on the I-405. What if the profits do not live up to expectations for Alternative 3 and we just have to live with the congestion created in the general purpose lanes? The express lanes will be useful for those traveling inter-regionally, but increased congestion in the general purpose lanes will severely impact local drivers' ability to use the freeway to travel to shopping, schools, and local jobs.

5

Alternative 3 will not increase the person-carrying capacity of the freeway, as it will not take cars off the road: 3+carpools are very difficult and there are no real transit options in the nearby area. If 2+ carpool drivers decide not to pay a toll and not to carpool anymore but to drive solo, it will actually increase the number of cars on the freeway (even more VMT and Greenhouse Gases) and also on our side streets. Congestion will also cause spill-over onto our local arterials. Seal Beach Blvd., Seal Beach's only north-south arterial, is easily affected by incidents on the freeway.

6

Population numbers used in the DEIR are pre-recession figures and traffic estimates could be inflated. Would there be a difference in the throughput between Alternatives 2 and 3 if population estimates from the 2012 SCAG RTP were used instead?

7

Sincerely,

Schelly Sustarsic
4288 Candleberry Ave.
Seal Beach, CA 90740

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-S

Response to Comment Letter PC-S1

Comment PC-S1-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification, Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S2

Comment PC-S2-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-S2-2

Please see Common Response – Elimination of Light-Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S3

Comment PC-S3-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Both Alternatives 1 and 2 retain the “non-toll” HOV lanes.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-S3-2

Architectural detailing to the proposed soundwalls, retaining walls, and bridges is proposed in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 3.1.7-85 as a mitigation measure in response to the proposed project's visual impacts.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S4

Comment PC-S4-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Soundwall, Noise/Noise Analysis, Property Values.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S5

Comment PC-S5-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS covers potential adverse effects and significant impacts of the proposed I-405 Improvement Project and measures to address those adverse effects and significant impacts, as required by CEQA and NEPA. The comment refers to a variety of existing problems on the eastbound ramps at Studebaker Road. Existing problems are not the focus of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS except to the extent that they may be made worse by the proposed project. The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS finds that the additional traffic added to the eastbound ramps is insufficient to result in an adverse effect or significant impact.

Caltrans standard practice for the assessment of effects to traffic as adverse, or of impacts to traffic as significant, does not include prescribed quantitative methods. Caltrans practice is to consider the data available in the determination of whether effects rise to the level of being

adverse or impacts to the level of significance. While many communities, such as the City of Long Beach, have prescribed quantitative methods for the determination of an adverse effect or significant impact to traffic, this is not the practice of Caltrans, which is the lead agency for the I-405 Improvement Project.

Comment PC-S5-2

As noted in the comments, CEQA requires a description of the existing conditions in the vicinity of the project. The eastbound SR-22 ramps at Studebaker Road are neither within the project limits nor sufficiently close to the proposed project to require such a description. The study area for the Supplemental Traffic Study, reported in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, includes an area much larger than the project limits. The purpose of larger limits for the Supplemental Traffic Study than for the project is to facilitate a determination of the potential of the proposed project to have adverse effects to traffic beyond the limits of the project. The sole purpose of the inclusion of the intersection of the eastbound SR-22 ramps and Studebaker Road in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS was to determine if there were potential significant impacts to traffic at the intersection resulting from the proposed project. Because no adverse traffic effects were identified and the intersection lies outside the project limits, no improvements are contemplated at the intersection. Tables 3-1, 3-10, and 3-12 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS provide details of the operations analysis conducted for the intersection under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The tables show that no adverse effects are anticipated at the intersection. Because intersections are the locations with the highest potential for adverse effects due to the conflicting traffic streams, the lack of adverse effects at the intersection indicates lack of adverse effects along the ramps.

Comment PC-S5-3

The determination that there is no adverse effect at the intersection of College Park Drive and the westbound SR-22 ramps is supported by the data in Tables 3-1, 3-10, and 3-12 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, respectively. For example, under the unsignalized condition (the intersection is currently unsignalized), Table 3-12 shows that delay on the stop-controlled approach would increase during the afternoon peak hour in 2040 from 152.1 seconds under the No Build Alternative to 158.2 seconds under Alternative 3. This level of increase (6.1 seconds) is not sufficient to support a finding of an adverse effect. The increase from the no-build condition of 152.1 seconds to 184.2 seconds (an increase of 32.1 seconds) under Alternative 1 and to 311.8 seconds (an increase of 158.7 seconds) under Alternative 2 is sufficient to support the finding of an adverse effect. See Response to Comment PC-S5-1 for a response to the topic of thresholds in the determination of whether effects are adverse.

Comment PC-S5-4

During project design, placement of signal heads would be considered so that vehicles on the SR-22 westbound off-ramp would have sufficient sight distance to see and react to a red signal indication and prepare to stop. During project design, a complete signing package would also be prepared.

Comment PC-S5-5

The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS covers potential adverse effects and significant impacts of the proposed I-405 Improvement Project and measures to address those adverse effects and significant impacts, as required by CEQA and NEPA. The comment refers to a variety of existing problems on the westbound ramps at Studebaker Road. Existing problems are not the focus of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS except to the extent that they may be made worse by the proposed project. For Alternatives 1 and 2, the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS includes Measure T-10, which would address the project's contribution to the cumulative adverse effect at the intersection of College Park Drive and the westbound SR-22 ramps at Studebaker Road.

Comment PC-S5-6

Signal coordination between the proposed new signal and the existing signal at the intersection of Studebaker Road and the SR-22 westbound ramps would be addressed during final project design.

Comment PC-S5-7

The proposed signalization at the intersection of College Park Drive and the westbound SR-22 ramps at Studebaker Road in Measure T-10 includes a protected (arrow) southbound left turn into College Park Drive.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S6

Comment PC-S6-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line, Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-S6-2

Please see Common Response – Shifting Improvements away from Residential Properties onto NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach Property.

Comment PC-S6-3

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S7

Comment PC-S7-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

All build alternatives reduce travel times within the corridor when compared with the No Build Alternative, thus reducing congestion.

Please see Common Response – Substantiation of Reported Corridor Travel Times for Build Alternatives.

Comment PC-S7-2

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-S7-3

Predictions are inherently risk laden. However, given the current levels of congestion and the forecast changes in population and employment, none of the proposed improvements is anticipated to eliminate congestion in the I-405 corridor; congestion is anticipated to be reduced in duration and extent. Congestion on freeways in Orange County is monitored under the Congestion Management Program administered by OCTA. Issues of blame and tax refunds should be addressed in a political forum rather than in an environmental document. A comparison presented in Table 3.1.6-4 of the Draft EIR/EIS shows, in shaded cells, how the existing freeway congestion compares to the congestion expected in 2020. Table 3.1.6-12 of the Draft EIR/EIS provides a similar comparison for 2040.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S8

Comment PC-S8-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Soundwall, Noise/Noise Analysis, Air Quality, Health Risk, Property Values, Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S9

Comment PC-S9-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Soundwall, Air Quality, Health Risk, Property Values.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S10

Comment PC-S10-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification, Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line, Air Quality, Measure M.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S11

Comment PC-S11-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The current construction along I-405 in the vicinity of SR-22, Seal Beach Boulevard, and I-605 is not part of the I-405 project, which is the subject of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. Lane configurations within the construction zone during construction are temporary.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S12

Comment PC-S12-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Property Values.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S13

Comment PC-S13-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Noise/Noise Analysis, Air Quality, Health Risks.

Comment PC-S13-2

Please see Common Response – Property Values.

Comment PC-S13-3

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange.

Comment PC-S13-4

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S14

Comment PC-S14-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The YouTube video referenced in the comment has not been included or addressed. In the “General Information about This Document” behind the cover page, the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS states: “If you have any comments regarding the information contained in this Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, please attend the public hearing and/or send your written comments to Caltrans by August 12, 2013.” A YouTube video is neither a written comment nor can it be reproduced for inclusion in the Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment Letter PC-S15

Comment PC-S15-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Caltrans thanks you for your attention to the details of the Draft EIR/EIS. The V/C ratios reported in Table 3.1.6-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS for the Seal Beach Boulevard intersection with the I-405 southbound ramps/Beverly Manor Road in 2040 in the columns labeled “Build Traffic on No Build Geometry” are incorrect and have been corrected in the Final EIR/EIS. The correct values are reported in the Traffic Study. Improvements are included in the I-405 Improvement Project for this intersection. Traffic information with the improvements is reported in Table

3.1.6-16 of the Draft EIR/EIS; that information, which has been verified, shows that with the proposed improvements there is no adverse effect to traffic at the intersection.

Comment PC-S15-2

Under the No Build Alternative, vehicles entering I-405 northbound from Seal Beach Boulevard must merge one lane left to access I-605 and one more lane left to continue on I-405 northbound. Under all of the build alternatives, one lane change plus a lane merge downstream of the SR-22 westbound off-ramp would be required to reach I-605 and two additional lane changes to reach I-405.

Comment PC-S15-3

The design for the transition areas at the end of the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 is preliminary and represents a worst-case condition necessary to make certain that any potential environmental impacts are identified. If Alternative 3 is identified as the preferred alternative, different designs for the transition areas will be considered during final design and optional designs may be used to address safety and operational concerns, such as those raised in the comment. If design changes result in environmental impacts exceeding those identified in the Final EIR/EIS, further environmental documentation may be required. Use of the worst case in preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS limits the potential for further documentation as a result of design changes.

Comment PC-S15-4

Please see Common Responses – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line, Air Quality.

Comment PC-S15-5

The latest data from the I-110 demonstration project in Los Angeles County presented to the OCTA Board of Directors on May 24, 2013, indicates that there is less congestion in the general purpose lanes and an increase in HOV/Express Lane usage than there was prior to implementation of the demonstration program. During the initial ramp-up period after the demonstration program started, there was an expected increase in general purpose lane congestion as motorists adapted to the new policies related to the HOV/Express Lanes.

The SR-91 Express Lanes are considered successful traffic management. They do not eliminate congestion in the general purpose lanes; they provide an option to that congestion to motorists willing to pay a toll. The tolls are set at the rates necessary to maintain high-speed operations. For an explanation of how this management works, see the Draft EIR/EIS page 2-20. For additional information, see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

All of the build alternatives are anticipated to reduce congestion in the I-405 corridor; none are expected to eliminate congestion in the corridor. The benefits to congestion vary among the build alternatives. The benefits to congestion of the build alternatives are summarized in the Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3.1.6-4 through, 3.1.6-8, and 3.1.6-12, through 3.1.6-14.

Comment PC-S15-6

Alternative 3 will increase the vehicle capacity of the freeway and thereby increase the person-carrying capacity of the freeway. For a discussion of changes in the HOV vehicle occupancy requirement, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment PC-S15-7

Throughput data cited in Table 3.1.6-14 of the Draft EIR/EIS would not be changed with use of the 2012 SCAG RTP data. The throughput data presented in the table are for peak hours under congested conditions, which are anticipated under any of the alternatives because peak-hour traffic demand will exceed capacity under any reasonable forecast.

This page intentionally left blank.